



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,716	01/19/2005	Hans Rudolf Gygax	102790-188 (30055 US)	2373
27389	7590	05/07/2007	EXAMINER	
NORRIS, MC LAUGHLIN & MARCUS			MCKANE, ELIZABETH L	
875 THIRD AVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
18TH FLOOR			1744	
NEW YORK, NY 10022			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/521,716	GYGAX ET AL.
	Examiner Leigh McKane	Art Unit 1744

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 5-9 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 January 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 04172007.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

Claim Objections

1. Claim 7 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 7 is currently dependent upon "claim 7". A claim cannot depend upon itself. It appears as if this is a typographical error and that, in fact, applicant intended to claim dependency upon claim 5 or claim 6, both of which recite the "support body" referenced by claim 7. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nightingale (GB 2,042,340).

Nightingale teaches a fragrance cartridge 18 comprising a reservoir 19 of fragrance and capillary channels 20 for controlling emission of fragrance from the device (Figure V; page 1, lines 39-43). The fragrance is prevented from leaking from the reservoir by capillary action. See page 1, lines 58-59. The capillaries may be 0.4mm in diameter and 20 mm long. See page 2, lines 59-61. Moreover, Nightingale evidences that the emission rate is just over 27.8 ng/s (0.1 mg/hr). See page 3, lines 5-7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaio et al. (US 20020114744) in view of Nightingale.

Chaio et al. teaches a substantially flat, rectangular support body **001** having a plurality of cartridges **004** embedded therein. Each cartridge **004** includes capillary tubing **010** for transporting scent from a scent reservoir **016** to scent release openings **011**. In addition, the support body **001** includes a memory storage unit **031** which can be a memory chip. The memory storage unit can also store scent recovery sequence information for use in coordinating multimedia playback and scent recovery information. See Abstract. In Figure 19, Chaio et al. evidences an embodiment wherein channels **044,045** in the support body **110** permit ingress of a carrier gas from pump means (fan) to assist in dispersal of the scent from the cartridge **004**. See

Figures 5, 6, and 19; paragraphs [0053]-[0054], [0089]-[0091], [0100]. Chaio et al. is silent with respect to channels within the cartridge to permit ingress of carrier gas into the reservoir.

Nightingale teaches a fragrance cartridge **18** comprising a reservoir **19** of fragrance and a plurality of capillary channels **20** for controlling emission of fragrance from the device (Figure V; page 1, lines 39-43). As Nightingale discloses that employing a plurality of capillary channels is particularly useful to achieve a higher emission rate, it would have been obvious to use the capillary channels of Nightingale as the capillary tubing of Chaio et al. in order to achieve improved emission of low-volatility liquids.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Coplan et al. (US 4,017,030) discloses a capillary emission device.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leigh McKane whose telephone number is 571-272-1275. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (5:30 am-2:00 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys Corcoran can be reached on 571-272-1214. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Leigh McKane
Leigh McKane
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1744

elm
2 May 2007